

1
2
3
4
5
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

7 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
8

9 LORENZO L. JONES,

CV F 05-00255 AWI SMS HC

10 Petitioner,

ORDER REGARDING PETITIONER'S
MOTIONS FOR EXPEDITED REVIEW AND
ORDER MODIFYING SCHEDULING ORDER

11 v.

[Docs. 7, 10]

12 PAUL M. SCHULTZ,

13 Respondents.
14 _____/

15
16 Petitioner is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a petition for writ of habeas corpus
pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241.

17
18 Petitioner filed the instant petition on February 22, 2005. On April 7, 2005, the Court
19 directed Respondent to file a response to the petition, and the response is currently due on or
before June 9, 2005.

20
21 On April 19, 2005, and May 10, 2005, Petitioner filed motions to amend the scheduling
22 order.¹ On May 13, 2005, the Court directed Respondent to file a status report regarding the
23 preparation of its response to the instant petition. Respondent promptly filed a status report on
24 May 18, 2005, indicating that a response can be filed on Friday, May 27, 2005. The Court will
therefore modify the scheduling order in an attempt to resolve the instant petition.

25 ///
26
27 _____

28 ¹ In the motions, Petitioner contends that he is scheduled for release to a halfway house on June 30, 2005,
and irreparable harm may result if the petition is not resolved expeditiously.

Accordingly, it is HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Respondent's response to the petition is due on or before **May 27, 2005**;
2. Petitioner's traverse is due on or before **June 17, 2005**;² and
3. All other provisions of the Court's April 7, 2005, order remain in full force and effect.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 19, 2005
icido3

/s/ Sandra M. Snyder
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

² Because of Petitioner's claim that the petition need be resolved expeditiously, the Court has shortened the time frame for Petitioner to file a traverse, as the Court's April 7, 2005, order gave Petitioner thirty days to file a traverse. If more time is needed Petitioner must file a request for an extension of time. Petitioner should however bear in mind that briefing by the parties must be complete before the Court can issue a ruling on the petition.